

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1430 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,012	12/31/2003	Suresh Rajgopal	03-LJ-017	9337
30425 7590 91/21/2011 STMICROELECTRONICS, INC.		EXAMINER		
MAIL STATIO	ON 2346	ZHU, BO HUI ALVIN		
750 CANYON COPPELL, TX	DRIVE, SUITE 300 75019		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
, , ,			2465	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/21/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

angie.rodriguez@st.com ip.us@st.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/750,012	RAJGOPAL ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
BO HUI A. ZHU	2465	

	BO HUI A. ZHU	2465						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address								
THE REPLY FILED 07 December 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.						
application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C	The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 4.1.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filled within one of the following time							
periods: a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	- d-tf N E iE							
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A 		in the final rejection, whi	hover is later. In					
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.					
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(THO THE ET WAS IN	LD WITHIN TWO					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.138(a). The data- have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL.	tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ite extension fee e action; or (2) as					
	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be t	iled within two months	of the date of					
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filled within two months of the date of filling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(a)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since Notice of Appeal has been filled, any reply must be filled within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).								
AMENDMENTS								
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to	out prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	cause					
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	nsideration and/or search (see NOT	E below);						
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo								
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	ter form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for					
appeal; and/or	and the second s	atad alabas						
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1		cted claims.						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		moliant Amendment (PTOL -334)					
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		inplicate / international (I OL OL+).					
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		imely filed amendmer	t canceling the					
non-allowable claim(s).	ionabio ii dabiiiittoa iii a doparatoj t	iniony mod amondmon	it our rooming the					
 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proving. 		be entered and an e	planation of					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:								
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected to								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and 								
was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome all rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	to provide a					
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.					
The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).							
13. Other:								
- —								
/Jayanti K. Patel/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2465								

Continuation of 3, NOTE: The proposed amendment would change the scope of independent claims 8 and 9 therefore require further consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's argumens have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Regarding claim 1, Applicant argues that Frank does not teach allocating memory blocks based on a pre-assigned maximum number of allocated blocks (Remarks, page 13). Examiner respectfully disagrees. Frank teaches a memory allocation process in which the requested memory is compared to a maximum value supported by the operating system, and memory is allocated based on the the result of the comparison (column 5, lines 26 -43). Clearly, that the maximum value supported by operating system is a pre-assigned element. Therefore, by the broadest reasonable interpretation, Frank's teaching discloses allocating memory blocks based on a pre-assigned maximum number of allocated blocks.